

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Jeffrey Davis et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,754

Filed: March 20, 2001

Docket No.: 10010106-1

Title: SCROLLING METHOD USING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed March 13, 2003. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Becker et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,337,694 ("Becker").

With this Response, claim 5 has been cancelled, claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, and 19 have been amended, and claim 24 has been added. It is believed that all claims are now in a condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

At the time of filing of the present application, the Applicants submitted an Information Disclosure Statement and PTO Form 1449, which cited several references, and provided copies of the cited references. The Applicants believe that these papers were timely submitted and in compliance with all rules and regulations. The Examiner acknowledged receipt of the Information Disclosure Statement in paragraph number one of the Office Action, and did not identify any deficiencies in the IDS papers. However, the Examiner stated that "unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered." The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the references cited by the Applicants in the PTO Form 1449, which were submitted with the present application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,337,694 ("Becker"). With this Amendment, the Applicants have amended limitations of independent claim 1 as follows:

providing a first plurality of user selectable scrolling zones on the display screen, each scrolling zone in the first plurality of scrolling zones associated with a scrolling technique and corresponding to scrolling in a first direction, each of the scrolling zones in the first plurality being positioned substantially adjacent to a first edge of the display screen;

providing a second plurality of user selectable scrolling zones on the display screen, each scrolling zone in the second plurality of scrolling zones associated with a scrolling technique and corresponding to scrolling in a second direction that is different from the first direction, each of the scrolling zones in the second plurality being positioned substantially adjacent to a

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Jeffrey Davis et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,754

Filed: March 20, 2001

Docket No.: 10010106-1

Title: SCROLLING METHOD USING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

second edge of the display screen, wherein the first edge is opposite to the second edge;

Becker does not teach or suggest a first and a second plurality of scrolling zones, each plurality corresponding to scrolling in different directions, and each plurality positioned on opposite edges of a screen as claimed in amended claim 1. Rather, Becker discloses a horizontal scroll bar and a vertical scroll bar. (See, e.g., Becker at col. 1, line 47 to Col. 2, line 11; Figure 3 and corresponding description). These scroll bars are not positioned on opposite edges of a display screen, and these scroll bars do not each include a plurality of scrolling zones as defined in claim 1.

The Examiner stated that:

With respect to dependent claim 5, providing a second plurality of user selectable scrolling zones on the display screen each scrolling zone in the second plurality . . . associated with a scrolling technique . . . different from the first direction . . . Becker discloses scroll buttons 65, 67, 66 and 69, each position to scroll in a different direction, figure 3.

With respect to dependent claim 6, first plurality of scrolling zones is positioned substantially adjacent to a bottom of the display screen . . . Becker discloses in scroll buttons positioned to the bottom of the display screen, figure 3, elements 66 and 69. (Office Action at para. no. 6, page 4).

As shown in Figure 3 of Becker, a **single** scroll button 69 is shown near the top of window 60, and three scroll buttons 65, 66, and 67 are shown near the bottom of the window 60. Or looking at the left and right sides of window 60, a **single** scroll button 65 is shown near the left side and three scroll buttons 66, 67, and 69 are shown near the right side. Thus, Becker does not teach or suggest a **first and a second plurality** of scrolling zones, each plurality corresponding to scrolling in different directions, and **each plurality positioned on opposite edges** of a screen as claimed in amended claim 1.

In view of the above, independent claim 1 as amended is not taught or suggested by Becker. In addition, dependent claims 2-18, which further limit patentably distinct claim 1, are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference. Allowance of claims 1-18 is respectfully requested.

With this Amendment, the Applicants have amended independent claim 19 to include the limitation that each scrolling zone in the first plurality of scrolling zones is "defined by

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Jeffrey Davis et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,754

Filed: March 20, 2001

Docket No.: 10010106-1

Title: SCROLLING METHOD USING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

hidden boundaries". As described in the specification of the present Application, "[i]n one embodiment, scrolling zones 202 and 204 are not displayed on display screen 200, and are therefore represented in Figure 2A by dashed lines." (Specification at p. 6, lines 8-10). Becker does not teach or suggest scrolling zones defined by hidden boundaries. Rather, as shown in Figure 3 of Becker, scroll buttons 65, 66, 67, and 69 are explicitly displayed to the user.

In view of the above, independent claim 19 as amended is not taught or suggested by Becker. In addition, dependent claims 20-22, which further limit patentably distinct claim 19, are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference. Allowance of claims 19-22 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 23 includes the limitations "determining . . . a first movement velocity . . .;" and "scrolling the displayed information on the display screen . . . in an amount based on the first movement velocity, the scrolling amount greater than the amount of movement of the screen pointer." Becker does not teach or suggest determining a velocity from movement information provided by a screen pointing device, nor scrolling an amount based on such velocity, nor that the scrolling amount is greater than the amount of movement of the screen pointer.

The Examiner stated that:

As per independent claim 23, a method for scrolling through information displayed on a display screen of an electronic device . . . comprising: receiving mode selection information from a user . . .; Becker discloses selection information received by the user, col. 6, lines 23-30; receiving movement information provided by a user with the screen pointing device; Becker discloses continuous selection of the scroll button varying the speed of the scroll, col. 5, lines 29-31; determining a first movement direction . . .; moving the screen pointer based on the received movement information; and scrolling the displayed information on the display screen . . . Becker discloses dynamically varying the speed of the scroll with the continuous selection of the mouse cursor, col. 5, lines 33-36. (Office Action at para. no. 6, page 6).

As indicated by the above quoted portion of the Office Action, the Examiner did not address the "velocity" limitations in claim 23. None of the portions of Becker cited by the Examiner, nor any other portion of Becker, teaches or suggests determining a velocity from movement information provided by a screen pointing device, or scrolling an amount based on

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Jeffrey Davis et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,754

Filed: March 20, 2001

Docket No.: 10010106-1

Title: SCROLLING METHOD USING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

such velocity, the scrolling amount greater than the amount of movement of the screen pointer.

In view of the above, independent claim 23 is not taught or suggested by Becker. Allowance of claim 23 is respectfully requested.

Newly Submitted Claim

With this Amendment, the Applicants have submitted new dependent claim 24. Claim 24 is dependent on claim 1, and includes the limitation "wherein at least one of the scrolling zones is defined by hidden boundaries that are invisible to a user of the electronic device." Since claim 24 is dependent on patentably distinct claim 1, claim 24 is believed to be allowable over the cited reference, and allowance of claim 24 is respectfully requested. In addition, claim 24 is further distinguishable over Becker. As addressed above with respect to claim 19, Becker does not teach or suggest scrolling zones defined by hidden boundaries. Rather, as shown in Figure 3 of Becker, scroll buttons 65, 66, 67, and 69 are explicitly displayed to the user. In view of the above, claim 24 is distinguishable from the cited reference, and allowance of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

In light of the above, Applicant believes independent claims 1, 19, and 23, and the claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Jeff A. Holmen at the below-listed telephone number or Pamela Lau Kee at Telephone No. (408) 553-3059, Facsimile No. (408) 553-3063. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Jeffrey Davis et al.

Serial No.: 09/812,754

Filed: March 20, 2001

Docket No.: 10010106-1

Title: SCROLLING METHOD USING SCREEN POINTING DEVICE

Agilent Technologies, Inc.

Intellectual Property Administration

Legal Department, M/S DL429

P.O. Box 7599

Loveland, CO 80537-0599

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Davis et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-0178

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: _____

JAH:jmc

6/11/03

Jeff A. Holmen

Reg. No. 38,492

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 11th day of June, 2003.

By _____

Name: Jeff A. Holmen